

REMARKS

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful examination of this case. Reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested in view of the instant remarks.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects the Applicants' claims 6 and 11 over a combination of Ellenby et al (US 5,625,765) and Skolmoski (US 6,574,352).

In connection with claim 6, on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner states as follows.

"Ellenby et al discloses a method of operating image display apparatus, which method comprises combining electronically in a common pixel format a low resolution image component from a first source, and a high resolution image component from a second source which is different from the first source (Col. 3, lines 54 – 57)....."

It is noted that Ellenby et al at Column 3, lines 52 – 57 actually states:

"In addition to simply overlaying a high resolution computer generated image onto a low resolution electronically formed image, certain image attributes, features, and characteristics

as determined by the camera can be extracted from the electronic image and used to act on the computer generated images to make them more realistic."

Thus Ellenby et al discloses a method by which images are amalgamated. The high resolution computer generated images are overlayed onto the low resolution electronically formed images. In Ellenby et al certain image attributes from the low resolution image are used to enhance the computer generated images to make them look more realistic. It is clear from Column 3 lines 32 - 52 that the two Ellenby et al images are superimposed upon one another with information from both being viewed by the observer where the images overlap. The content of the computer generated image is enhanced by the real image.

It is important to realise that the two Ellenby et al images are not combined in a common pixel formation which is that of the higher resolution image. This is because the Ellenby et al low resolution images from the electronically formed image at the low resolution are used to enhance the computer generated image without any increase in pixel resolution. Therefore the Ellenby et al combined image contains information at both the high and low resolutions.

At the top of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner further states that Ellenby et al discloses the following:

".....whereby the high resolution image component is able to be positioned anywhere in a display obtained from the image display apparatus (Col. 11 lines 24 – 26)....."

Column 11, lines 24 – 26 of Ellenby et al actually states:

".....finally that composite image is displayed 216 to a user aligned to the real scene in proper perspective according to the users position".

Thus Column 11 lines 24 – 26 of Ellenby et al actually describes the correspondence between the two images. The high resolution computer generated image is an image of an object already contained within the low resolution electronic image, i.e. the real scene. The high resolution computer generated image is overlaid over the low resolution image, and amalgamated with it. Therefore the high resolution image is not able to be positioned anywhere within the image display apparatus (as required by the Applicants' claim 1) but only at a location at which the content of the computer generated image corresponds to the low resolution image real scene. The location of the high resolution computer generated image cannot be positioned anywhere because it will not correspond to the real scene low resolution image.

At the top of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner further states the following:

"Ellenby et al does not specifically teach that the low resolution image is a wide field of view and the high resolution image is a narrow field of view, this is disclosed in Skolmoski in column 1, lines 15 – 20."

Skolmoski discloses in column 1, lines 15 – 20 that many systems provide either high resolution over a narrow field of view or low resolution over a wide field of view because of computing power limitations and optical imaging limitations. Although the Examiner states that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine wide field of view low resolution images with narrow field of view high resolution images, the method of the present application as claimed in the Applicants' claim 6 is not disclosed by the combination of Ellenby et al and Skolmoski. More specifically, in claim 6 of the present application, the high resolution component is combined with a low resolution image at a common pixel format. The area within the low resolution image at which the high resolution image is located contains only high resolution image information from the high resolution image. No image detail from the low resolution image is visible. At no point in the combined image does the image information consist of image data comprising low and high resolution image data as disclosed by Ellenby et al. In the Applicants' invention, the composite image displayed consists of a discrete region or area of high resolution image which is surrounded

or bounded by a low resolution image. There is a distinct boundary at which the high and low resolution images meet. The information contained in the high resolution image is from a different source than that of the low resolution image, and as such the content of the high resolution image is completely independent of the low resolution image. This enables the high resolution image to be positioned or located anywhere in the display as there is no dependency on the low resolution image. This is not the case if the method disclosed by Ellenby et al is adopted because the Ellenby et al high resolution computer generated image has some correlation to the low resolution image at all times.

In connection with the Applicants' claim 11, the Examiner states on page 3 of the Office Action that Ellenby et al at Column 10, lines 1 – 20 discloses apparatus which the low resolution wide field of view image component is of a background scene, and in which the high resolution narrow field of view image component is of a target. Ellenby et al actually discloses a technique in which detailed image information is superimposed onto the background image data, this data having undergone "pixel expansion". The superimposed data is also not a common pixel format.

The Applicants additionally rely for the patentability of claim 11 on the fact that claim 11 includes all of the features of claim 6, and claim 6 is believed to be allowable for the above stated reasons.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 7 – 10 as being unpatentable over Ellenby et al, in view of Skolmosky and further in view of Sussman et al (US 5,686,980). The Applicants' claims 7 – 10 are believed to be allowable because they include all of the features of the Applicants' claim 6, which claim 6 is believed to be allowable for the above stated reasons. In addition, it is noted that the Examiner needs to combine together no less than three patents in order to support the allegation of claims 7 – 10 being obvious. It is respectfully submitted that the need to combine three patent specifications together is itself an indication of an invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this **RESPONSE** is found to be **INCOMPLETE**, or if at any time it appears that a **TELEPHONE CONFERENCE** with Counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or one of his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Thack
Thomas E. Thompkins, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,136